Into-My-Void 8:54 PM
Hi OhNoTokyo,

I noticed the entire discussion (including your replies) was deleted. Should I take that as a form of ghosting? Because from where I stand, removing the record of a philosophical exchange looks a lot like walking away from it.

I find it sad, honestly: you seemed genuinely thoughtful, but also strangely afraid to clearly define your own worldview. That's the one part of philosophy that shouldn't inspire fear; it should inspire clarity, curiosity, and maybe even a bit of wonder...

OhNoTokyo 9:23 PM
You have been determined to have been acting under false pretenses with your discussion. Although I was obviously unhappy with your choice to decide to post our discussion and misrepresent our discussion to take a victory lap at my expense, you also seem to have posted a month ago under false pretenses by claiming to be "undecided" in a post here. You aren't undecided, you're a pro-choice activist. It is dirty pool to take a conversation like that and treat it like a formal debate that you have "won".

Into-My-Void 10:41 PM
I understand why you might feel frustrated, but I want to clarify something. I never misrepresented myself: everything I wrote in our discussion reflected my real views and questions. What I did do was treat that exchange the way I treat ideas in my professional life: as material for analysis.

I'm a science teacher; testing arguments is literally part of what I do. When I posted the debate later, I wasn't mocking you: I was dissecting the reasoning, the same way I would a lab result. It's what philosophy and education are supposed to do: take complex discussions, examine them, and make them teachable.

If I'd found that your framework held up under scrutiny, I genuinely would have incorporated it. Either it might have shifted my own position, or at least given me a coherent pro-life argument I could use to play devil's advocate when teaching ethics in science. Here in Canada, that viewpoint is rare; being able to articulate it clearly and defend it logically would actually be a teaching win.

That said, I understand that my later post about our debate might have come across as a bit insulting. The humor and "popcorn" framing were meant to make the discussion more accessible to teenagers on r/ProChoiceTeenager, not to ridicule you personally. It was a tone choice for that specific audience, not a jab at you.

I get that it probably felt personal, but it wasn't meant that way. I didn't "trap" you, I tested the logical structure of your framework and published my observations. If that makes me an "activist," then so is every academic who publicly evaluates an argument.

Deleting the debate doesn't erase what happened: it just removes the opportunity for both sides to learn from it. People reading it, pro-life or pro-choice, could have taken something valuable away. And nothing was stopping you from inviting other pro-life voices to join and strengthen your side, that's how collective reasoning grows.

And honestly, if you were truly confident in the coherence of your worldview, you wouldn't need to delete the discussion. A consistent philosophy can withstand scrutiny. Deleting it doesn't make the argument stronger; it only signals doubt where conviction should stand.

Into-My-Void 11:00 PM
Ironically, you once wrote to me:

"I appreciate your willingness to ask the question outside of those pro-choice echo chambers."

That's still what I've been doing all this time: asking questions outside my own echo chamber, and expecting my interlocutor to do the same. It's just disappointing that when the questions became too precise, the discussion vanished.

And honestly, I'm still looking for a strong, coherent, scientifically and statistically defensible argument in favor of the pro-life position. I'd *like* to find one. It would make the moral landscape richer, and it would give me something to challenge my students with when I teach critical reasoning in ethics and science. But so far, I haven't seen it. I was hoping you might be the one to finally provide it.

OhNoTokyo 11:07 PM
Academics who publicly evaluate a position in a debate do not misrepresent their intentions as you have.

While you seem to have pretensions as an academic, your actions seem to be calculated as ambushes, rather than academic debate.

Ironically, as you have noted, I see the rhetorical use of misrepresenting your intentions and your position as you have.

I do not, at all, believe that you are looking for a strong pro-life position. Your comments in your own profile suggest that you are inst looking for content to use to convince others to be pro-choice, including your students, who you have mentioned you have a duty to b neutral in your teaching of them, but you work to induce doubts to meet your ends.

neutral in your teaching of them, but you work to induce doubts to meet your ends.

It's hard for me to determine whether you're really aware of just how cynical your tactics are, or whether you are somehow unaware of the need to not treat earnest discussions as material for "popcorn eating". Either way, I am sorry that I was taken in. It is always a risk with engaging with opponents on the Internet that they will act in such a manner, but it was worth an attempt to try.

It is too bad that you have revealed yourself to be so disappointing in this regard.

OCT 29

Into-My-Void 12:44 AM
Oh, don't be so cross, OhNoTokyo; the "cynical means" aren't personal. Honestly, it's more a side effect of how I think. I'm autistic; I tend to treat every discussion like a system to analyze, not an emotional exchange. I've been called a "pragmatic robot" often enough that I've learned to own it. Nothing about this was meant as an ambush.

And really, Canada *is* practically a pro-choice echo chamber. Until this year, I'd never actually been confronted with a serious pro-life worldview. My curiosity was genuine; I wanted to understand the internal logic of your framework, not just the surface slogans.

I actually have a few pro-life students this year. I respect them deeply and think they deserve to see their views represented fairly. Soon my ethics-in-science unit starts, and I know they'll want to debate abortion. With the pushback they'll face, it would be cruel not to help them build stronger arguments. You've already given me some useful material for that: your "plane" analogy, for instance, was one of the clearest I've seen in a while.

I've thought about it some more and I want to clarify something about your "cynicism" comment. I didn't misrepresent myself or my intentions. I approached our exchange exactly the way I approach scientific inquiry: by defining terms, testing the internal logic of a framework, and documenting results.

That isn't deception; it's analysis. I never pretended to share your worldview: I examined it according to its own principles. Publishing that reasoning later wasn't mockery; it was the philosophical equivalent of peer review.

You're interpreting my detachment as cynicism, but it's really methodology. Scientists, especially those of us who study systems objectively, have to separate emotion from analysis. It's how we preserve intellectual honesty.

You once said you appreciated my willingness to ask questions outside my echo chamber. That's exactly what I did. If the discussion made you uncomfortable, that's understandable, but discomfort isn't betrayal. It's the natural side effect of critical thought.

You know... If you're serious about wanting to reach people outside "echo chambers," why not take that spirit to r/ProChoiceTeenager? You could post something like "The Revenge of OhNoTokyo: Prove Me Wrong." I'd even make sure the moderators (myself included) don't remove your comments, as long as they remain civil. That way, you'd have the chance to plant seeds of doubt among people who've probably never heard a well-structured pro-life argument before.

And if someone's beliefs change because of that, it won't be because they were "indoctrinated"; it'll be because they finally tested their ethics against something solid. That's how genuine reasoning works. You could even link your strongest points back to r/ProLife if you want; the cross-pollination would do both communities good.

If your system is truly coherent, it should stand in open debate. If it can't, then maybe that's exactly where those seeds of doubt belong.

OhNoTokyo 1:39 AM
Peer review, as you should be aware, consists of intentional submission of prepared findings to a journal or at least a letters site. Our discussion, while I took it as seriously as can be expected for social media, is not what I would have considered appropriate for peer review in any field.

As I pointed out before, I did not consider my thoughts to have the necessary level of work behind them to present them as a complete discussion of my entire framework. While I have a strong internal understanding of it, there are a number of facets of it which I consider incomplete.

In any event, the tone of your posts has led me to believe I cannot trust your motives. An honest approach to this would have been to alert me ahead of time to your intent to publish our discussion with your commentary.

And I note, your offer for me to provide rebuttal only came after I discovered your posts. I do not believe I would have been offered that opportunity otherwise.

Into-My-Void 8:56 AM
You're technically right that academic peer review involves consent and structure: but that's not the sense in which I used the term. Intellectual peer review happens any time an argument is presented in public. Once you publish reasoning in an open forum, it enters the public arena, where analysis and critique are both fair and expected. That isn't deception; that's discourse.

You say your framework wasn't "refined enough" to be examined. But that's precisely how frameworks become refined: through challenge

Message

my ethics-in-science unit starts, and I know they'll want to debate abortion. With the pushback they'll face, it would be cruel not to help them build stronger arguments. You've already given me some useful material for that: your "plane" analogy, for instance, was one of the clearest I've seen in a while.

I've thought about it some more and I want to clarify something about your "cynicism" comment. I didn't misrepresent myself or my intentions. I approached our exchange exactly the way I approach scientific inquiry: by defining terms, testing the internal logic of a framework, and documenting results.

That isn't deception; it's analysis. I never pretended to share your worldview: I examined it according to its own principles. Publishing that reasoning later wasn't mockery; it was the philosophical equivalent of peer review.

You're interpreting my detachment as cynicism, but it's really methodology. Scientists, especially those of us who study systems objectively, have to separate emotion from analysis. It's how we preserve intellectual honesty.

You once said you appreciated my willingness to ask questions outside my echo chamber. That's exactly what I did. If the discussion made you uncomfortable, that's understandable, but discomfort isn't betrayal. It's the natural side effect of critical thought.

You know... If you're serious about wanting to reach people outside "echo chambers," why not take that spirit to r/ProChoiceTeenager? You could post something like "The Revenge of OhNoTokyo: Prove Me Wrong." I'd even make sure the moderators (myself included) don't remove your comments, as long as they remain civil. That way, you'd have the chance to plant seeds of doubt among people who've probably never heard a well-structured pro-life argument before.

And if someone's beliefs change because of that, it won't be because they were "indoctrinated"; it'll be because they finally tested their ethics against something solid. That's how genuine reasoning works. You could even link your strongest points back to r/ProLife if you want; the cross-pollination would do both communities good.

If your system is truly coherent, it should stand in open debate. If it can't, then maybe that's exactly where those seeds of doubt belong.

OhNoTokyo 1:39 AM

Peer review, as you should be aware, consists of intentional submission of prepared findings to a journal or at least a letters site. Our discussion, while I took it as seriously as can be expected for social media, is not what I would have considered appropriate for peer review in any field.

As I pointed out before, I did not consider my thoughts to have the necessary level of work behind them to present them as a complete discussion of my entire framework. While I have a strong internal understanding of it, there are a number of facets of it which I consider incomplete.

In any event, the tone of your posts has led me to believe I cannot trust your motives. An honest approach to this would have been to alert me ahead of time to your intent to publish our discussion with your commentary.

And I note, your offer for me to provide rebuttal only came after I discovered your posts. I do not believe I would have been offered that opportunity otherwise.

Into-My-Void 8:56 AM

You're technically right that academic peer review involves consent and structure: but that's not the sense in which I used the term. Intellectual peer review happens any time an argument is presented in public. Once you publish reasoning in an open forum, it enters the public arena, where analysis and critique are both fair and expected. That isn't deception; that's discourse.

You say your framework wasn't "refined enough" to be examined. But that's precisely how frameworks become refined; through challenge and critique. Claiming your position is internally consistent while declaring it unready for scrutiny isn't humility; it's insulation. Philosophy doesn't evolve in private.

As for the supposed misrepresentation: my posts were public from the moment I wrote them. I never hid them, never locked them, never presented myself differently elsewhere. The record was always visible and anyone, including you, could have joined or responded. Transparency was built in from the start.

If your distrust comes from the fact that I analyzed the discussion, then you're mistaking honesty for hostility. I didn't distort your position; I examined its internal logic, exactly as you presented it. You were comfortable with that process until the contradictions emerged and then the problem wasn't the reasoning anymore, it was me.

If your worldview truly stands on reason, it shouldn't need protection from examination. Deleting the discussion doesn't preserve integrity; it only signals that confidence in your position collapses under public light.

To keep things fair, I'm actually considering posting our exchange on r/AmItheAsshole, to get an outside perspective from neutral parties. You'd be more than welcome to join that thread and present your side. My view of the situation will inevitably be biased (I'm directly involved, after all) but an open audience can judge both versions on their own merits. That's what transparency looks like.